



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov  
DNW Jan-07

PETER G. CARROLL  
MEDLEN & CARROLL, LLP  
SUITE 350  
101 HOWARD STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105

**COPY MAILED**

**JAN 24 2007**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of :  
Min-Hao Kuo :  
Application No. 10/773,911 : DECISION ON PETITION  
Filed: 6 February, 2004 :  
Atty Docket No. MSU-08548 :

This is a decision on the petition filed on 6 November, 2006, under 37 CFR 1.137(b),<sup>1</sup> to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

The application became abandoned on 22 June, 2006, for failure to timely reply to the non-final Office action mailed on 21 March,

---

<sup>1</sup> Effective December 1, 1997, the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) now provide that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition filed under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

(1) the required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In a nonprovisional utility or plant application filed on or after June 8, 1995, and abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may also be met by the filing of a request for continuing examination in compliance with § 1.114. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof. In an application, abandoned for failure to pay the publication fee, the required reply must include payment of the publication fee.

(2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m);

(3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and

(4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).

2006, which set a three (3) month shortened statutory period for reply. No extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained. Notice of Abandonment was mailed on 10 October, 2006.

Petitioner has filed an amendment with the present petition.

The statement contained in the instant petition does not set forth that the entire delay from the due date of the required reply to the date of the filing of a grantable petition was unintentional as required by 37 CFR 1.137(b)(3). However, the statement contained in the instant petition is being so construed. Petitioner **must** notify the Office if this is not a correct interpretation.

An extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 must be filed prior to the expiration of the maximum extendable period for reply.<sup>2</sup> The three-month extension request filed on 6 November, 2006, was submitted more than six (6) months after the end of the period for reply to the Office communication mailed on 21 March, 2006, and therefore is unnecessary. It is also noted that the extension of time fee has been charged twice. Both extension of time fees will be credited to counsel's deposit account. The duplicate petition fee will also be credited to counsel's deposit account.

This application is being referred to Technology Center Art Unit 1636 for further processing.

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (571)272-3231.



Douglas I. Wood  
Senior Petitions Attorney  
Office of Petitions

---

<sup>2</sup> See In re Application of S., 8 USPQ2d 1630, 1631 (Comm'r Pats. 1988).